

*Electoral Boundaries*

unworkable proposal that was made in the report of the commission in 1973. Yesterday, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) spoke about the opposition to part of West Nipissing going into Timiskaming. I think the opposition would be even stronger to the 1973 report of the commission.

The third proposal which was made in the preliminary maps of the 1976 redistribution commission report proposes that a portion of the regional city of Sudbury be put in with the Algoma riding. There was strong representation from various representatives in the city opposing this before the Electoral Boundaries Commission when it held its hearings in Sudbury, as well as a long petition. I attended one meeting in Walden to hear the representations opposing this. I believe that on the basis of those representations and alternatives, the commission came to the decision to put a portion of the city of Sault Ste. Marie in with the Algoma riding which did not have adequate population to meet the minimum standards of the act. Perhaps this solution is not completely satisfactory. Perhaps it is impossible to come up with a completely satisfactory proposal. However, it is a workable solution to meet the minimum requirements of the act and to provide adequate representation and service to the ridings concerned.

I hope the commission will take a further look at the number of representatives from northern Ontario with a view to providing 12 representatives rather than 11 as is now proposed in the report of the commission.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think I could rise on a point of order in which I have less personal interest than this one, for we have very few speakers left in this debate. However, with the long list of speakers that I understand is still before us, and because of the fact we are dealing with these objections province by province, unless we do something we shall not reach British Columbia until about 3 a.m. I wish to suggest that the House now agree that from here on the speeches be limited to ten minutes.

**Mr. Blaker:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would like to reinforce what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has said. I have been asked to take some responsibility with regard to members of parliament from all parties from the province of Quebec who wish to speak on this matter.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** How many have you got?

**Mr. Blaker:** I have a list of 22 members from the province of Quebec who want to speak. However, that may grow as others also have the right to speak. If they each take the time allotted to them, we will be some time. It is a matter of courtesy to the other provinces that we adopt this procedure I do not want to see members sitting here until two or three in the morning simply because some members decide to take their full 20 minutes. I support the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in requesting that we cut back speeches to ten minutes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** I have a list of Liberals. They will take approximately an hour and 20 minutes. There are four Conservatives. I would say that

[Mr. Foster.]

within two hours we will be finished with the province of Ontario.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** As you just said, Mr. Speaker, that is just the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker) mentioned Quebec. There are others as we go across the country. I certainly would not want to impede the right of any member to speak; however, I hope the consensus will be such that we can now obtain a House order with respect to limiting the speeches of ten minutes hereafter, following the hon. member who I am sure will follow the spirit of the order.

● (1600)

I submit that all members must be given a chance to make their comments. There is at present a House order governing the time set aside for this debate; but if each speaker speaks at length there may not be enough time to complete this debate in accordance with the terms of the House order. Frankly, I am trying to discover when one parliamentary day ends and another begins.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It ends immediately before the new day begins, at five minutes to 2 p.m.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Bearing in mind that we must be fair to all hon. members, and what this debate is all about, I wonder if the House would not be prepared to agree unanimously to an order limiting speeches to, say, ten minutes.

**Mr. Philbrook:** Mr. Speaker, I oppose the hon. member's suggestion. I understand his position. I prepared a speech which will take more than ten minutes to deliver, and closer to 20 minutes. It is unfair to expect someone, on about a minute's notice, to cut a speech in half. I do not think it can be done properly and I am afraid I insist on opposing the hon. member's suggestion.

**Mr. Foster:** If I may speak on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, as most members favour an agreement which would give all a fair chance to speak, would it not be better if the House leaders met, did their calculations and then returned with a proposal which the House could consider?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. I understood that originally there were to be 13 speakers from the Liberal party. Several have already spoken, and two were to take only four or five minutes. I calculated that the Liberal side of the House would need about one hour and 30 minutes. It appears, from what I have heard, that the opposition party on my left wishes to put up four speakers. If they can tell me how much time they will need, we can make more accurate calculation.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the point you just mentioned, I am prepared to take less than ten minutes. I understand that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is also prepared to abide by the suggested restraint. Perhaps it would be useful, if the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook) agrees, if the hon. member were to speak later. That would give him enough time to shorten his speech. Perhaps he could keep it within the confines which might be suggested in the House order.